



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

HUSBAND AND WIFE—SUBROGATION OF WIFE TO RIGHTS OF CREDITORS FOR NECESSARIES.—Defendant and plaintiff were husband and wife living in New York. Defendant went to New Jersey, abandoning plaintiff, and neglected to provide her and the children with necessities. Unable to procure goods on his credit, because he had none, plaintiff was forced to purchase needed articles, with her own earnings, eked out by a small inheritance. She sought in this action to recover the money so paid. *Held*, the wife could recover, on the theory of *subrogation* to the rights of the tradesmen who had furnished the necessities. *DeBrauwere v. DeBrauwere* (1910), 126 N. Y. Supp. 221.

There seems to be no precedent in the books for such an action. Under a statute similar to the Married Woman's Act of New York, it has been held that the wife cannot recover damages from the husband for refusal to support. *Decker v. Kedly*, (Alaska) 148 Fed. 681, 79 C. C. A. 305. If that holding is sound, recovery should not be permitted, because of a variation in theory, on the facts shown here. Moreover, the propriety of employing the doctrine of subrogation may well be doubted. The "creditors" through whom the wife claimed made no contract with the husband, but with the wife personally. Since they did not rely on his credit, and were paid by the party with whom they contracted, it is difficult to see how the tradesmen acquired any rights against the husband, to which plaintiff could be subrogated, *Skinner v. Tirrell*, 159 Mass. 474, 34 N. E. 692, 21 L. R. A. 673, 38 Am. St. Rep. 447, unless, perhaps, a statute has created a special liability, cf. *Edminston v. Smith*, 13 Idaho 645, 92 Pac. 842, 14 L. R. A. (N. S.) 871. However, some courts have gone far in giving a remedy by subrogation to third persons who have loaned the wife money with which to buy necessities. *Kenyon v. Farris*, 47 Conn. 510, 36 Am. Rep. 86; *Leuppie v. Osborn*, 52 N. J. Eq. 637, 29 Atl. 433. But it would seem that the more logical way to work out the wife's equity to the desired result would be through her own right against the husband, as for money paid to his use, or for damages to her separate property by his failure to support.

INN-KEEPERS—LIABILITY FOR GOODS OF GUEST—TERMINATION OF LIABILITY.—P, a guest at D's hotel, about 4 p. m. paid his bill which included charges up to six o'clock that evening, and left the hotel without any intention of returning. He placed a list of his baggage in the hands of one of the servants of the hostelry, with instructions to turn the various pieces over to a transfer man who would call. The express man came around about five o'clock, and D's porter was negligent in not verifying the number of pieces with the list, and a valuable suit case with contents was lost. Action for damages. *Held*, that the relation of inn-keeper and guest, and the former's extraordinary liability as an insurer, did not terminate as soon the guest paid his bill and left the hotel with the intention of not returning, since the guest had a reasonable time thereafter in which to remove his baggage. *Kaplan v. Titus* (1910), 125 N. Y. Supp. 397.

The courts are by no means harmonious as to the liability that an inn-keeper assumes concerning the property of his guest. Three distinct views are entertained. Most courts hold that the inn-keeper is an insurer of the